

H 5244

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

into any statistical report, yet it may extend for generations.

Dr. Roux spent 6 weeks abroad, traveling to cities in Egypt, Greece, Cyprus, Yugoslavia, Italy, and Turkey. His warm reception in each country shows that the splendor of music overcomes political differences. Often traveling into the provinces of these countries as a Musical Ambassador for the United States, Roux gave many people who have never seen this country perhaps the most vivid impression they will ever have of the United States.

The American Embassy in Yugoslavia reported that after 3 days in the country, Robert Roux's "superb skill as a pianist, his ability to achieve a rapport with students, and his unassuming, affable personal style made him an exceptional effective representative of the United States and the Artistic Ambassador Program."

The American Embassy in Egypt stated, "Robert Roux was an outstanding success both as a pianist of great technical ability, expression, and sensitivity and as a fine teacher. He is very gracious and understanding but at the same time thoroughly professional."

In Greece, the Embassy noted that Roux "made a strong and very positive impression during his stay in Greece." Cyprus relayed that "his visit to Cyprus was described by the Cypriot Musical Community as a complete success and they would welcome him back any time in the future." Italy reported that "Roux, an absolutely splendid pianist, was a grand success." Finally, the American Embassy in Turkey stated that "his brilliant technique and exquisite musicianship won over his audiences, while his gentle, knowledgeable teaching style earned him high praise from conservatory students and teachers alike."

I want to emphasize that Robert Roux is an outstanding citizen of Wichita as well as the United States. His willingness to serve his country as an Artistic Ambassador makes me proud. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Robert Roux for personally bringing the people of the world closer together through the magic of music, and my thanks also go to the U.S. Information Agency for initiating this unique and rewarding program.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEFEATING TERRORISM, THE ART OF WAR, AND THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk on defeating terrorism,

the art of war, and the lessons of history.

I choose this moment to talk about this because there is a great deal of attention being paid currently to terrorism and, unfortunately, we as a country tend to focus only on the immediate. We tend to focus on this week's crisis, this week's problem, this week's hostages; but, in fact, there are certain basic rules of history, there are certain basic rules of the art of war which have to be examined if we are going to successfully defeat terrorism.

It is fascinating, for example, to go back and look at a book entitled "International Terrorism," edited by Benjamin Netanyahu, and the "Proceedings of the Jerusalem Conference on International Terrorism", published by the Jonathan Institute, Jerusalem, 1981.

It is very sad to read day by day what was a conference held from July 2 to July 5, 1979, on terrorism, because, as you read example after example of the necessary steps to fight terrorism, the things that should be done, steps that were proposed by a wide range of people from West Germany, from Holland, from France, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, the United States, Israel, and you then look at recent news magazines, recent reports, one thing you can conclude is that we in the West, between each crisis, between each headline, have managed to avoid learning the fundamental lessons.

□ 1250

I think it is important that the Reagan administration, the news media, and the elected Members of the legislative branch take the current energy and attention of the American people, the moment in which people are still thinking about the recent hostage crisis, the period in which the problem of terrorism is still close to the top of our agenda, and apply that energy to learning the basics, to fundamentally establishing new approaches and new systems for winning the war against terrorism.

In fact, I would suggest that the Reagan administration should not undertake single step actions whether diplomatic, economic or military. It is not vital whether or not we close the airport in Beirut. It is not vital whether we manage reprisals against the two terrorists who were on the airplane when the American sailor was killed. It is not vital that any single thing happen. What is vital is that we avoid tactical activity which gives the weight and illusion of doing something without the long, difficult process of thinking through the dangers and difficulties we face.

In other words, we Americans are often so eager for a solution that we reach out for any action which makes us feel good without having thought through the process. What is it going to achieve? Where are we going to get?

Claus

over a century ago. In "On War," the greatest modern treatise in the art of war, Clausewitz warned that, and I quote:

No one starts a war or rather no one in his sense ought to do so without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war and how he intends to conduct it. The former is its political purpose; the latter is its operational objective. This is the governing principle which will set its course, prescribe the scale of means and effort which is required, and make its influence felt throughout, down to the smallest operational detail.

In recent years, all too often the national security bureaucracy, the State Department, the Defense Department and the National Security Council have undertaken short-term tactical actions which were too large to be elegant and effective, and too small to be massive and effective. Both Desert I and more recent activities in Lebanon; the Embassy bombings, the Marine barracks bombing and the retaliation raid with two aircraft shot down and an American pilot held as a prisoner of war in Syria, should serve as a warning that the bureaucracies have failed at small operations for the last 11 years, and are likely to fail in the current crisis.

It is vital that the President ask four tough questions of the national security bureaucracies:

First. What are the strategic goals for which we are willing to risk the lives of our sons?

Second. Assuming our opponents are tough, dedicated and competent, what steps can they take to counteract and withstand our strategies? If phase I fails, what are the costs to the United States? What would a phase II require to assure American goals are achieved despite our opponents' counterefforts? American defeats in the Bay of Pigs, Vietnam, and Lebanon in 1983 were all in large part caused by failure to answer these questions prior to committing forces.

Third. What institutional and legal changes are necessary to enable the United States to effectively wage war on terrorism? Now is the time to repeal the liberal welfare state prohibitions on intelligence agencies, on police training the Third World, et cetera.

Fourth. How can the President and his allies act systematically to develop popular and political legislative understanding of and support for a long-term strategy which can defeat terrorism? In a free society, the most important and powerful Presidential reaction to today's events is to use them to educate the country to support tomorrow's actions.

It is possible to build a pattern of firmness, preparedness, and toughness strategically without taking immediate tactical actions involving force. Eisenhower, on numerous occasions in the 1950's and Kennedy in the 1961 Berlin